UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,434	09/08/2000	Eric Schneider		2924

24226 7590 10/22/2003

ERIC SCHNEIDER
13944 CEDAR ROAD
258
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, OH 44118

EXAMINER	
DENNISON, JERRY B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/658,434	SCHNEIDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jerry B Dennison	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/14/03* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09/08/2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification of in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

2. Please include the Patent Application Serial Number on page 1, line 10 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 2 recites the limitation 'two consecutive " " delimiters' in line 11, which is indefinite. It is not clear whether the claim reads "two consecutive quotation mark delimiters" or "two consecutive space delimiters" or "two

consecutive delimiters, where each delimiter consists of a quotation mark, followed by a space, followed by another quotation mark." Appropriate corrections are required.

5. Claim 3 recites the limitation 'includes a "." delimiter' in line 14, which is indefinite. The specification refers to the delimiter as a "dot." Appropriate corrections are required.

6. Claims 8-10 depend on claim 6. However, claim 8 recites the limitations "said spelling error" and "said hyperlink" in line 6. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said spelling error" in lines 9 and 10. Claim 10 recites the limitation "said hyperlink" in lines 12 and 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. For examination purposes, claim 8-10 will depend on claim 7. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an

application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 1, 3-5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (U.S. 6,510,461) (hereinafter "Nielsen'461").

8. Regarding claim 1, Nielsen'461 discloses a method for processing text comprising the steps of: parsing a word from the text (col. 3, lines 35-50, Nielsen teaches of parsing text); determining that said word includes a highest-level domain (HLD) (col. 3, lines 35-50, Nielsen teaches of parsing text for a network address and checking if it is a valid URL); and, distinguishing said word from any other word that does not include said HLD (col. 3, lines 35-50, Nielsen teaches of parsing text for a network address.).

9. As per claim 3, Nielsen'461 discloses further including the step of determining whether said word includes a "." delimiter followed by any symbol other than that of a " " delimiter before determining that said word includes said HLD (col. 7, line 60 through col. 8, line 15, Nielsen teaches of a parser that is configured to identify URL's including a second-level domain, followed by a period, followed by a top level domain selected from a set of recognized top level domains.).

10. Regarding claim 4, Nielsen'461 discloses wherein said step of determining that said word includes said HLD further including the step of comparing said word to a table of resolvable top level domains (TLDs) (col. 8, lines1-5, Nielsen teaches that a TLD selected from a set of globally recognized top level domains).

11. Regarding claim 5, Nielsen'461 discloses wherein said step of distinguishing said word from any other word that does not include said HLD further includes the step of selecting from one of a font, character size, color, underline, redline, background attribute, and reverse video to provide a distinguishing characteristic (col. 5, lines 58-60 and col. 7, lines 30-37, Nielsen teaches the documents containing the text being formatted in HTML language, having human-readable typographical characters. HTML web pages contain text having a font, character size, color, underline, redline, background attribute and reverse video to provide a distinguishing characteristic.).

12. Regarding claim 11, Nielsen'461 discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including a processor and a memory in operative association with said processor (col. 5, lines 6-25).

13. Regarding claim 12, Nielsen'461 discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen'461, as applied to claim 1, in view of Chaney et al. (hereafter "Chaney" "6,104,990").

16. Nielsen'461 shows all the features of the invention regarding claims 2 except wherein said step of parsing said word further includes the step of creating said word by extracting all symbols between any two consecutive " " delimiters from said text.

17. Chaney discloses of a method of extracting words and phrases from a document using a space or other punctuation characters as delimiters (col.3, lines 15-32).

18. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nielsen's system of parsing network addresses with Chaney's method of extracting words and phrases using delimiters for the benefit of conserving process time while parsing documents.

19. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen'461, as applied to claim 1, in view of Nielsen (U.S. 5,907,680) (hereinafter "Nielsen'680").

20. Nielsen'461 shows all the features of the invention regarding claim 6 except further including the step of processing the text with a spell checker. However, Nielsen'680 discloses of three components representing three unique but complementary methods of providing the user with spell check services for checking spelling of network addresses (col. 2, lines 35-60).

21. Regarding claim 7, Nielsen'461 does not disclose wherein said step of processing the text with said spell checker further includes the steps of determining from said spell checker that the text includes a spelling error, determining that said spelling error includes said HLD, and generating a hyperlink corresponding to said spelling error. Nielsen'680 discloses a spell-checking system, which the document is successfully sent to the user via URL, because the text includes a URL (Figure 15 and col. 12, line 59 through col.13, line 6)

22. Regarding claim 8, Nielsen'461 does not disclose further including the step of determining whether to replace said spelling error with said hyperlink. Nielsen'680 discloses a spell check system that displays a list of URL's to the user in a hypertext format (col. 6, line 63 though col. 7, line 5).

23. Regarding claim 9, Nielsen'461 discloses comparing the top level domain with a list of globally recognized top level domains (col. 8, lines 1-6). Nielsen'461 does not disclose wherein said step of determining that said spelling error includes said HLD. Nielsen'680 discloses a spell-checking system, which the document is successfully sent to the user via URL, because the URL was valid (Figure 15 and col. 12, line 59 through col.13, line 6).

24. Regarding claim 10, Nielsen'461 does not disclose providing a user interface element to select from one of a label, resolution method, and hyperlink activation. Nielsen'680 discloses a list of URL's displayed to the user in a hypertext format where the user can select one of the URL's or cancel (col. 6 lines 63-67).

25. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of parsing network addresses by Nielsen'461 with the collaborative spell check of URL's by Nielsen'680 for the benefit of providing the user with information referenced in documents by a valid URL containing spelling errors or providing a list of URL's based from and invalid misspelled URL, without having to manually fix the errors, conserving the user's time.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

33. U.S. Patent No. 6,092,100 to Berstis et al.

34. U.S. Patent No. 5,745,360 to Leone et al.

35. U.S. Patent No. 5,892,919 to Nielsen

36. U.S. Patent No. 6,332,158 to Risley et al.

37. U.S. Patent No. 6,148,289 to Virdy

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry B Dennison whose telephone number is (703)305-8756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

39. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703)308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

40. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

JBD

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER